
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 April 2025 by E Street BSc (Hons) MSc

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 07 May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/25/3360996

39 Kenmore Road, Kenton, Harrow HA3 9EU

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Akram Basheer against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref is PL/2652/24.
 - The development proposed is a first floor extension and internal alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matters and Main Issue

3. Prior to the making of this recommendation, a revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published. Having reviewed the changes, I am satisfied that they do not affect the substantive matters of the appeal and that proceeding without further consultation with the main parties would not be prejudicial to their respective cases.
4. The Council have expressed concerns with the accuracy of the drawings with particular regard to the rear dormer. However, and for the purposes of this appeal, the plans are sufficient even with the smaller dormer to establish the visual effect of the scheme as a whole. The main issue for which is its effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal site is an end terraced dwelling which along with this block is surrounded by semi-detached buildings of a similar form and two storey height. To the rear, where surrounding buildings are extended, there are modest and clearly subservient additions. As a result, there is a pleasant consistency and homogenous feel to the character and appearance of the area.
6. The proposal would result in a pitched roof first storey which would sit in front of the existing dormer window. The siting along with the intersection of the dormer would unbalance the rear elevation of the dwelling in terms of natural hierarchy and appear as an incongruous addition relating awkwardly with the rest of the dwelling.

Moreover, the side elevation of the property which would be marginally viewed from the roadside, would present a large and blank elevation dominating and shielding the primacy of the host dwelling. The proposal in combination with the other extended elements would create a bulky rear elevation which would shield the original almost in its entirety. Additionally, the increase in built form would stand the resultant dwelling out against others in the street scene detrimentally affecting its homogenous relationship therewith and the modesty of the surrounding dwellings.

7. The proposal would not be visible on the street scene; however, this would not diminish the importance of the affected elevation to the character and appearance of the area. Moreover, the works would be visible from the rear of many neighbouring properties and as such sufficiently exposed to have an impact on the area. With this and the above in mind, the appeal scheme would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore conflict with Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021), Policy DM1 of the Harrow Council Development Management Policies (2013), the relevant provisions of the Harrow Supplementary Planning Document Residential Design Guide (2010) and the Framework. These policies and guidance require a high standard of contextually appropriate design amongst other things.

Other Matters

8. The appellant has advised that they can make adjustments to the roofline to integrate better with the dormer. However, this is a matter for the main parties to determine outside of the planning appeal process as this has not been submitted for consideration.

Conclusion and Recommendation

9. For the reasons given above, the appeal scheme would not comply with the development plan, and I have been given no other compelling reason, taking into account other material considerations advanced, to deviate therefrom. I therefore recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

E Street

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

10. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR